

SEP 25 1973

Christian Order



Summary of Contents for August, 1973

LITURGICAL REFORM
AND DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

The Editor

SEPTUAGINT: SHADOW
CABINET OF PRIESTS

Angela Meyrick

WHAT SIZE DIFFERENTIALS (1)

J. M. Jackson

POPULATION CONTROL
AND CATHOLIC SOCIAL DOCTRINE

Peter Rea Hunt

DARK CORNERS

Paul Crane, S.J.

CLAVER HOUSE

would like to place on public record its great gratitude to the Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund. During past years the Fund has supported most generously the Leadership Training Courses given each year at Claver House for Overseas Students. Vital financial assistance has been provided with great kindness when it was most urgently required.

Father Paul Crane, S.J., Director of Claver House, would like to remind readers of *Christian Order*, particularly those living in Scotland, that donations would be received most thankfully by the Honourable Treasurer of the Fund, the Right Reverend Michael Foylan, Bishop of Aberdeen, 156 King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Contents

Page

450	INVITATION TO ANARCHY <i>The Editor</i>
453	READINGS AT MASS <i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
456	LITURGICAL REFORM AND DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM <i>The Editor</i>
467	POPULATION CONTROL AND CATHOLIC SOCIAL DOCTRINE <i>Peter Rea Hunt</i>
474	THE DUTCH SEDITION <i>Angela Meyrick</i>
493	WHAT SIZE DIFFERENTIALS? (I) <i>J. M. Jackson</i>
501	ANY QUESTIONS? <i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
507	BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

If You Change Your Address: Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 14

AUGUST 1973

NUMBER 8

Invitation to Anarchy

THE EDITOR

“UNTIL this week, we have not been plagued in this country with the worst excesses of extremism, but now that we have seen the depths to which Catholics can stoop, it is surely time for those to speak to whom these people will listen. And that must surely mean the bishops. They must speak before the ill-considered deeds of a few embittered clergymen finally carry off a small but no less precious section of the Catholic community into an ecclesiastical backwater of unsound theology and plain bad manners.”

Out of context, this quotation from the *Tablet* of June 9th might well be thought of by any normal, unsuspecting Catholic as applying to some group of Catholic Progressives, who had exceeded the bounds of liturgical behaviour as laid down by the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship in its *Third Instruction for the Correct Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (Catholic Truth Society, 8p.). In fact — and somewhat startlingly — the reverse was the case. The words were applied by the *Tablet*, not to a way-out group of Progressives, but to an exasperated group of traditionalist Catholics, who tried, however wrong-headedly, to interrupt with the recital of the Rosary what the *Tablet* described somewhat disingenuously as a “perfectly ordinary *missa normativa* with

the insertion at certain points of carefully chosen texts from the works of Father Teilhard de Chardin". Disingenuously, I say, because the insertion of the Chardin texts made the *missa normativa* celebrated by Father John Coventry, S.J., at the French Church in Leicester Square on June 4th, anything but perfectly ordinary. Because of their insertion it became perfectly extraordinary; and, as such, in defiance of the *Third Instruction of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship* and, therefore, in defiance of Rome.

For what the Third Instruction lays down amongst other things is that "the liturgical texts composed by the Church also deserve the greatest respect", and that "When Mass is celebrated with special groups, texts which are more suited to the group may be chosen, provided they are taken from an approved lectionary".

It could be, of course, that Father Coventry and his friends were granted permission for the Chardin Mass at the French Church on Monday, June 4th. If this was the case, then I tender my apologies at once; but I hardly think it was. And my reason for thinking it was not the case is found, once again, in the *Third Instruction* where it is laid down that the Bishops may authorise the kind of Coventry "happening" we had on Monday, June 4th, provided the Holy See approves of the proposed modifications in advance; "a complete outline and programme of the modifications should be proposed to the Holy See before any experiments are begun". Now, even today, if there is one thing I cannot see, it is the Holy See giving permission for readings from Teilhard de Chardin to be inserted in the *missa normativa* in preference to those from the Church's approved lectionary. From which I conclude that permission was never granted for the Chardin Mass in Leicester Square on Monday, June 4th. What this means in brutal fact is that it was said in defiance of Church authority. I am sorry to be so rough; but there seems no escape from this ugly fact.

The next thing we get, some five days later, is the *Tablet* calling on the Bishops somewhat archly to use their authority against a group of Catholics, who protested in church against

those who blatantly defied it. Quite apart from the fact that this is the first time in years I have seen the *Tablet* demanding that the Bishops exercise their authority (in support of those who defy it), I would like to suggest that the demand, in this case, represents one of the most barefaced invitations to ecclesiastical anarchy that I have ever had the misfortune to come across.

Bishops Please Note

In fact, in modern western society the churches' main problem is indifference: how to make people sit up and take any notice of religion at all. Not many lazy half-agnostics are going to do that if the churches deliberately impoverish themselves by shedding much of their distinctive flavour. In a desperate search for "relevance", for a common denominator with the secular world, the churches are beginning to concentrate on economic and political problems and to neglect their awkward spiritual superstructure. This tendency has already pushed the World Council of Churches into a one-sided overcommitment to revolutionary third world politics. The same is happening in other churches too. The most unsatisfactory thing about this is that it leaves the churches with the role of ancillary social welfare agencies, and little else. There is, of course, nothing wrong with doing good works for the rest of humanity; how to help his fellow man has always been one of the Christian's central preoccupations. But this has always taken place in the context of a strong spiritual orientation. That orientation is less and less in evidence in most churches today.

The oddity is that this increasing over-concentration on social and political issues could hasten, rather than arrest, the present decline of organised religion. What many people want is real spiritual food, and they are not getting it . . . *The Economist*, 14/7/73.

Readings at Mass

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

CHAPTER 55 of Isaiah may be read as background for the readings from the sixth chapter of John which began on July 29 with the miracle of the loaves. It is also useful for the understanding of these readings (which for some reason omit verses 36-40) that we should have some idea of what is meant in the Bible by the "word" of God.

"God said, Let there be light; and there was light" (Genesis 1,3). In everyday life we realise that there are words which do not die away once they are uttered: a promise, a threat, a word of love. If words have the necessary power behind them they bring about what they signify: a last will and testament or the sentence of a judge. (For peoples who had little or no writing, the importance of the spoken word was emphasised.) When the all-powerful God makes known his will, his "word" does not "return to me empty, but it shall accomplish that which I purpose" (Is. 55,11).

In the Old Testament this word is most often the word of the prophets, God's spokesmen. Their words shape history (Jer. 1,9-10), which is the reality fulfilling the divine utterance. God has a purpose in history, which the waywardness of his people does not frustrate. Through the experience of history, interpreted by the word of the prophets, God's character and purpose is communicated to the Jews, though incompletely, "at various times and in various different ways" (Hebrews 1, 1). In a wider sense the line of those through whom God spoke goes back to Moses, the greatest of the "prophets" (Deut. 18,18; cf. John 6,14).

In the New Testament, St. John opens his gospel by speaking of the Word who was with God (the Father) "in the beginning" (cf. Gen. 1,1) and was himself God. In

speaking thus of Jesus, John is presenting him as the ultimate and complete self-communication of God to men (cf. Heb. 1,2). Throughout this gospel, Jesus insists (as indeed he must to the strictly monotheistic Jews) that he is not an independent source of supernatural life. This is clear in chapter 6 (37-40,44-46); it has been stated even more explicitly in 5,19 ff. God communicates himself to man in and through Jesus Christ.

"The Word was made flesh" (1,14) — an astounding statement! He whose words are spirit and life (6,63) is personally united to what is transitory, mortal and imperfect (cf. Is. 55,8-9). "The flesh has nothing to offer" (63); yet Jesus has just said that he will give "my flesh, for the life of the world" (51). This is possibly the Johannine version of the words of institution of the Eucharist (cf. Luke 22,19), and since there is no Aramaic word for "body" may be closer to the actual words of Christ. But "how can this man give us his flesh to eat" (52) and in this way nourish us with eternal life? The resurrection and ascension of the Son of Man (62) will resolve this enigma. "In this very flesh, now invested with all the life-giving power of the Spirit, he will be able to give himself as food which can communicate the eternal life that is his, and sow in their bodies the seed of his own resurrection" (1). "The incarnation is the first step in a process of salvation which is completed by the coming of the Spirit, without whom there could be no Eucharist" (2).

Some commentators would deny any connection between "flesh" in verses 63 and 51, but this would seem to suppose that verses 51-58 (August 19) have been inserted into the discourse from, perhaps, the Last Supper. However attractive this theory may be, there is no real evidence for it. Still, there remains the problem of relating these verses to what has gone before.

Remembering what I said about the "word" of God,

(1) J. Delorme & others: *The Eucharist in the New Testament*, p. 155.

(2) J. L. McKenzie: *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. *Flesh*.

you will understand what is meant by the text quoted by our Lord in answer to Satan (Mt. 4,4). "Man does not live by bread alone, but by everything that proceeds out of the mouth of God" (Deut. 8,3). There is reference in that text to the "manna" with which the Israelites were fed in the desert: a food which was "heavenly" in the sense of providential rather than strictly miraculous. There was a popular belief that a new Moses would repeat this "miracle": it is this to which the people refer in 6,30-31. But Jesus tells them that they must "work for the food that endures to eternal life" (ch. Is. 55,1-3) and that to work for God means believing in Jesus.

"Because faith in Jesus is essentially personal", Fr. Feuillet has written ⁽³⁾, "there is a sort of logical continuity between adhering to Christ by faith and participating in the Eucharist". If Jesus is "bread from heaven", could this not mean union with him by a physical eating? Jesus teaches that it does; and the bread that men will eat is his flesh, his true humanity, but divinised by his resurrection and ascension.

The relation between "believing" and "eating" is the same as between "spiritual" and "sacramental" communion: the Council of Trent taught that the former is not just make-believe or the longing for something not there, but the real reception of the grace of the sacrament. To quote Fr. Feuillet again: "The interior enlightenment which transforms men into disciples of Christ really gives Christ to men and men to Christ; it feeds them already on Christ, the Bread of Life" (3). It gives eternal life (verses 40 and 47), though it looks forward to and presupposes the Eucharist.

Finally, it may be noted that the Eucharist itself depends on a "word" which brings about what it signifies: "This is my Body". Even though the word was uttered weeks ago — by itself the bread is just bread.

(3) *Johannine Studies*, pp. 119 & 114. Cf. first reading, Aug. 19.

CURRENT COMMENT

The Afrikaner mentality, which would freeze "our Bantu People" in a supposed cultural past, finds its counterpart today in the Church in Africa, where expatriate priest-reformers seek to impose liturgical forms on African people and priests, in many cases, against their will.

This is but one form of "Guided Democracy" or "Democratic Centralism", which is found increasingly in the Church today and which has its spiritual home in the Soviet Union.

Liturgical Reform and Democratic Centralism

THE EDITOR

I GET so very annoyed with those postcards which come to me from time to time from the Republic of South Africa. I don't mean the animal ones or those others which show so beautifully great sweeps of that country's lovely countryside. It is not that kind of postcard I am thinking about. What I have in mind are those others which purport to show you scenes from African life; "our happy Bantu people" decked out in their primitive finery, clustered together in varied village scenes, on view in these pictures, so to say, like so many antiques; relics of the past, to be preserved for the white man's pleasure, "our happy Africans" pickled in their primitive state by way of witness to the white man's condescension.

"Our Happy Bantu"

I confess that I find this infuriating. The idea of pre-

serving people at a certain level of development because, in your opinion, it is better for them to remain there; it is the arrogant condescension behind this outlook that I find quite revolting. So, too, does the African himself. He does not want to remain in that state to which, the Afrikaner insists, it has pleased God to call and keep him. He wants to move on, to develop like the rest of mankind; and why, in the name of God, should he not want to do so? If South African postcards of "our happy Bantu" annoy a person like myself, what must they not do to intelligent Africans, of whom there are many in the Republic of South Africa, every time they see them? One need only ask what one's own reaction would be to postcards on sale for American visitors in London, depicting "happy Britons" painted blue with woad and munching bones in primitive Celtic settlements. "For Heaven's sake, cut all that out; we left that behind long ago" — our reaction would go like that. Culture is not to be identified with one particular stage of a people's past. It is subject to evolution, which will succeed to the extent that it is built on and develops out of the traditions of the past. Swingeing change can kill a country's culture; not so, quiet, ordered growth, which has its roots in a country's past. What the African in South Africa wants is that he should be allowed to grow with the rest of men. Only that; which is also his right, as it is yours and mine.

Expatriate Reformers and Spiritual Apartheid

What interests and, indeed, disturbs me further in this context is the way in which many so-called reformers within the Church would seem to be imitating in the liturgical sphere, in some countries of Africa, the bad example set by the South Africans in that which is secular. In at least one of several African countries where I found myself recently the impression given to the indigenous clergy by over-enthusiastic, expatriate liturgical reformers was that the object of their exercise was to return the African people liturgically to their primitive past, which

the reformers had identified, quite wrongly as it seems to me, with African culture. Not for African Catholics any longer a share in the orderly evolution of Christian Worship; they were to be taken by the scruff of their necks and set in the deep-freeze of the past. All this at the *diktat* of expatriate priest-reformers determined to impose on African priests and people alike what the latter regarded shrewdly and sharply as no more and no less than a species of spiritual apartheid, which would cut them off from the main-stream of Catholic living as effectively as present South African policy cuts off "our happy Bantu people" from the main-stream of South African life; making out a case for "African Christianity" (I know one African archbishop who bitterly resents the term) as something different and quaintly primitive to be preserved as the mark of a Church which is regarded, by implication at least, as retarded.

I wonder if the reader is fully aware of the import of what I am writing; of the implications of what I have just said. I am talking about the liturgical carve-up of Africa, imposed, in too many cases, on the Christians of that continent by expatriate missionaries, who are as ruthless in having their way *against* the wishes of African clergy and people as ever the men of Trent were reputed to be. The curse of Africa today are those young white missionaries, who are imposing liturgical change at a primitive level against the wishes of the African people and, by so doing, professing to know what is best for them better than they know themselves. Because of the odour of spiritual apartheid implicit in these liturgical policies and the manner of their imposition, these men are disliked beyond words, to put it mildly, and widening divisions are created in some countries between expatriate and African priests. At a time when problems facing the Church in Africa are only too many, you have the additional problem of the widening gap, brought by attempts to impose new liturgies, between expatriate and indigenous priests. If there is one thing the African clergy and people

want; if there is one thing to which they have a right, it is that — subject to the guide-lines set by Rome — they should be in charge of their own liturgical destiny, not have it laid out for them by young progressive and often totally inexperienced, expatriate clergy and sisters whose vaunted liberalism would appear to desert them completely when it is a matter of imposing on African Catholics their own liberal ideas with regard to liturgical practice.

I have never professed to be an “expert” on Africa, for the simple reason that I am nothing of the kind; but I am blessed with many African friends, both clerical and lay, and they are good enough to speak with me most openly about these things. If there is one thing I know it is that they have no desire at all to hurry in this matter of liturgical (or, for that matter, catechetical) change and that they wish its pace and content to be dictated by themselves. They are sick to death of the expatriate “experts”, who are let loose on them nowadays at such frequent intervals; sick of their talk and sick of the almost total irrelevance of so much that is discussed. They want to build up the Church in Africa on the firm foundations laid by the great missionaries of the past whom they love and revere. In God’s name, why not let them do it? What they wish is no more than their duty and their right. The least that can be done by the expatriate missionary in Africa today is to cease making difficult for his African brothers the exercise of both.

Aboriginal Mass at Melbourne

And not only in Africa. I was interested when I was there recently to note the reaction in one country of both priests and bishops to the “Aboriginal Mass” at the Melbourne Eucharistic Congress. They shuddered at the thought of it. Readers, perhaps, will remember, as they did, the picture in the Catholic Press of men three-quarters naked, their black bodies lavishly coated with stripes of

white paint, and girls in grass skirts prancing round an altar where Mass was being said. The Mass, of course, had been devised by a white priest (with what degree of agreement from the people I know not, but I think I can guess!) as typifying "Aboriginal Culture" and, as such, had received the approval of Rome. What got my African friends was the impression conveyed by the picture — not of a Mass said with reverence, but of "uncivilized" black people put on display to be stared at in their gaudy nudity by a congregation of "civilized" whites; in the same way that, in South Africa, "uncivilized" but "happy Bantu", preserved in their primitiveness, are put on display for "civilized" white tourists — to be stared at like animals in a zoo by prodding and prurient Europeans. It was the same, they sensed, at Melbourné — not by design, obviously, but by unwitting implication — and they were intensely angry that it should have been so. They felt — as, indeed, I felt myself — that the one thing the Aboriginal Catholics wanted was to be received on equal terms with their white brothers in Christ and that one way to do this, the only way to do this effectively, was not to make a show of them (as was in fact done), but to invite them to kneel side by side — white and black — round the same altar at the same Mass. Instead of this, so crudely, they were put on parade, to be stared at like zoo-exhibits by their fellow-religionists. It could be that this thoughtless action has left a scar on Australian Catholicism which time will not easily erase.

Democratic Centralism

One is driven to ask, when considering reforming action of the sort, whether it is made in the true interests of the Church or, by way of experiment, to satisfy the itch for change of a small in-group of Progressives. I incline to the latter view, if only for the fact that changes of the sort just described tend to be flaunted and put across with what would appear to be little consideration for the

feelings of the Faithful by men and women who appear, at times, somewhat resentful of any criticism levelled against their liturgical innovations. As I write these lines, I am thinking, for example, of Father John Coventry's reaction to the criticism from the Catholic Priests' Association, which greeted the announcement that, as part of a "Festival of New Forms of Worship" during the days before Whitsunday, he would be celebrating a Mass that would include readings from Teilhard de Chardin and at which "professional performers" would assist. He was described in the Press as "dismissing" the objections raised against this and other Masses to be said during the Festival; in a radio interview that followed, he would appear to have been equally abrasive. The impression given is that Father Coventry and those who think with him on these matters are determined to press on regardless with liturgical experiments of their choosing, irrespective of the wishes of the Faithful; and that those who object — which means, I imagine, the great body of Catholics in this country — are to be given little or no consideration by the enlightened and élitist reformers, who are in process of giving the Faithful the kind of liturgy they alone know to be good for them.

What this adds up to, of course, is guided democracy; what is known in the Soviet Union as Democratic Centralism — not genuine democracy at all; but an arrangement under which, in the name of democracy, change is imposed on the People of God, by those who profess to know what is good for them better than they know themselves. I do not think it unfair to say that this sort of attitude is not altogether unusual amongst reformers in today's Church. I am thinking, in this connexion, of a reformist American Bishop, who suggested to his colleagues at an episcopal conference that the Faithful should undergo instruction before they could be considered fit to pass judgment on a proposed reform. In other words, they had to be brainwashed to the point where their judgment accorded with that of the reforming bishop himself.

At this point, the Faithful would be pronounced fit to pass what was, in the mind of this bishop, the only conceivable judgment on the proposed measures: viz., one that was completely in accord with his own. This, once again, is Democratic Centralism with a vengeance and as practised, I am afraid, in the Church today by small unrepresentative groups of *outré* reformers amongst laymen, priests and religious, who have adequate means of communication and publicity at their disposal and who understand the workings of Democratic Centralism; that is, how to make use of the democratic process to secure power, which is then used to force unwanted views on the Faithful in a parish or diocese or on the members of a religious order. These views are unwanted and unrepresentative, but their proponents are determined that they should prevail. They are prepared too often, I am afraid, to use most tricks of the trade to ensure that they do; and in view of the fact that those who oppose them are not prepared to use the same tricks, the small, ruthless group of Progressives usually wins through — for the same reason and in the same way that a ruthless Communist group wins through against the majority in a trade union, takes control and, then, in the name of the majority which it does not truly represent, puts forward measures which are, in fact, thoroughly unrepresentative and heartily disliked by all concerned. I have the uneasy feeling that the same kind of thing is happening today in the Church; that the Faithful are being saddled with practices — liturgical and otherwise — which they in no way want, but which are being imposed on them in the name of themselves by those who have worked their way into positions of power from which they claim to represent the Faithful as a whole. This is the way of Democratic Centralism. Those who practice it in today's Church have not let the example of Soviet Russia pass them by.

Progressives and the Faithful

The thing I have been writing of can happen in another

way. Like tends to attract like and it is more or less inevitable that people who hold the same views should tend to come together, especially at a time when emotions run high, as they do in the Church today. Thus it is that not only Progressives, but Traditionalists as well, tend to congregate in each other's company. This makes, of course, for polarization — two groups at the edges contending for the soul of a large and increasingly confused mass of Catholics in the middle. In the field we are here considering — which lies outside that covered by faith and morals — what each group has to avoid is not only the kind of word or action that confuses the mass-in-the-middle still further, but the kind of temptation that bids the members of either group credit the mass with views that are peculiarly their own. In the case of groups of Progressives, which we are considering here, I would suggest that they have been much too inclined to attribute to the mass-in-the-middle way-out views, which belong only to themselves; then, on the basis of this attribution, to claim that these same views are representative of the Church as a whole; then, finally, to advocate their adoption and, indeed, enforcement because truly representative. The process is simple and its inauguration the fruit, very often, not of malice, but of illicit and, in all probability, subconscious generalization. If one may take an example — a progressive group, say, in a chaplaincy makes a practice of receiving communion in the hand. After some time, its members make, consciously or subconsciously, an illicit generalization and attribute their own desire for the general establishment of this practice to the mass-in-the-middle whose views they think of, quite mistakenly, as truly represented by themselves: their enthusiasm and their naivete have led them into a false generalization. "This", they say quite wrongly, "is what the Faithful really want" (when the Faithful want nothing of the kind). Next, on the basis of this mistaken generalization, they pressurise Rome in the name of the Faithful whom they now claim to represent. Finally, permission is granted for the adoption of a

practice, which the Faithful do not want, as and when desired. Not wanting its adoption, the Faithful do not ask for it, but the Progressive Group does "in the name of the Faithful". Permission for the local adoption of the practice is then granted, owing to pressure of "public demand". This, of course, is the point of no return; one from which there can be no going back. Yet another unwanted practice has been imposed on the Faithful over their heads and without their consent.

I think it neither fanciful nor mean to suggest that the "Festival of New Forms of Worship" with its Chardin and Dancing Masses, which was put on by an enthusiastic, interdenominational group during the days before Whitsun, may well be seen in retrospect as a first step in the same direction. Priest-enthusiasts in the group, like Father Coventry and Father Donovan, may well claim as representative of the Faithful at large the kind of congregation which gathers for this type of liturgical occasion, but which, in fact, is composed in the main of Catholics who think as they do. The next step will be to suggest that, as these liturgical experiments met with enthusiasm from the Faithful, Rome should allow as normal practice in the Church that which began, in fact, as no more than an experiment at the instance of a small, unrepresentative group.

Press Propaganda and Liturgical Imposition.

It seemed to me, at the time, that the way was being prepared in advance for this kind of evolution. In the words of *The Guardian* for June 2nd, shortly before the Festival was due to take place:

"'That's the Spirit', a Festival of new forms of religious worship, opens in London tomorrow night to a background accompaniment of grumbling clergymen. Ultra-conservatives allege the festival is too wordly, even irreligious.

"The ecumenical organisers say the singing and

dancing and praying, interspersed with jazz and folk music, religious ceremonies, poetry readings, and liturgical ballet and comedy, are all part of the new spiritual wave sweeping through the Church. Spontaneity and joy are returning to worship."

In advance, then, those opposed to the Mass being used in this fashion are dubbed "Ultra-Conservative". Why not "Conservative" or, even, "traditionalist"; why the "ultra", which I attribute neither to Father Coventry nor Father Donovan, but which does carry the implication that those opposed to the Festival are no more than a bunch of old fuddy-duddies, holed up in a corner and griping at the new spirit of "spontaneity and joy", which according to *The Guardian* reporter, is "returning to worship". In other words, according, once more, to *The Guardian* reporter and those with whom he talked, not only are you a reactionary if you object to the Mass being played with in this fashion; you are a kill-joy, a Puritan out of tune with the deepest longings of the young generation.

I believe myself that this is nonsense, but never mind what I believe here. I have a simpler point to make. It is that, from the angle of Press Propaganda, the Festival of Liturgical Experimentation — somewhat vulgarly called "That's the Spirit" — got off to a very good start. Claims made in its name, as representative of the alleged new spirit of joy in the Church, will be found by Rome very hard to resist.

The Responsibility of Bishops

By way of postscript, I would add that I have assumed throughout this article that permission was sought for the Festival from appropriate authority within the Church. I say this because there have been many cases where permission has not been sought for *outré* liturgical celebrations by small, way-out groups of priests and laymen — Mass being said, for example, by civvy-suited priests at

the end of a meal and with readings from John F. Kennedy substituted for the Scriptures. It goes without saying that this kind of practice is outrageous in its flagrant disobedience of the wishes of the Holy See. Bishops, I hope, will stamp on it and stamp on it hard wherever it is to be found and at no matter what cost to themselves. I make no accusation here against Catholic organisers of the Festival of Liturgical Experimentation. I merely suggest, because of all there is at stake, that Bishops display exceptional vigilance in this matter. It is right to remind them that, for any failure here they will be accountable ultimately to Almighty God.

Population Control and Catholic Social Doctrine

PETER REA HUNT

IT is abundantly clear that the population-controllers who advocate and implement policies of contraception and abortion have received, in recent years, a tremendous boost from the ecological movement. In the decade of the sixties, awareness of environmental damage exploded in advanced industrial countries, and today the problem of pollution is so well-publicised that, on the one hand, many people are sick and tired of hearing about it, while, on the other, naïve assumptions about its true causes have become unquestioned bases for genetic totalitarianism. Thus, in the name of environmental protection and of a decent human life, it has become almost commonplace to read and hear of suggestions like the "pill-in-the-bread" idea of Prince Philip, or of compulsory sterilisation, compulsory abortion and even of genetic horrors reminiscent of Huxley's *Brave New World*.

It is obvious, of course, to any sound moral thinker, that, even if over-population were a primary cause of pollution and other environmental damage, the means of dealing with it must themselves be moral ones. Thus, if we assume that the world's population is growing at a rate that means certain starvation and certain deadly and irremediable damage to existing resources, we are faced with a dilemma for the Christian conscience; namely, that of reconciling sound morality concerning procreation and birth of human life with apparently certain global suicide. For some of those Catholics who accept the interpretation of population growth and ecological consequences set forth by such commentators as Paul Ehrlich, the apparent dilemma is being "solved" by compromise on contraception and abortion. Much of the uncertainty about the validity of traditional

Catholic teaching on contraception, in particular, has stemmed from worry about the population trends.

Now it is important to realise that, if the population and environmental crisis is accurately set forth in the secular humanist writings now dominating the intellectual scene, and if traditional Catholic moral teaching is valid, the conclusion to be drawn is really an affront to God's providence. It would mean that the Creator had designed a world where some basic defect meant that by increasing and multiplying (and by inference obeying the natural law in marriage) man would face global death. This is blasphemy. The conclusion to be drawn from this reasoning is plain enough: those who accept the Catholic Church's teachings on contraception and abortion (and this means accepting the natural law basis for the moral norms by which we Catholics can make judgements about society accessible even to those without a supernatural faith), cannot accept the common, secular humanist interpretation of the population crisis. Rather than infer that Providence has made a mistake, and thereby blaspheme the source and light of our lives, we have to see clearly where we human beings have abused the gifts of nature and the gift of intelligence.

This brings us to the crucial challenge facing the Catholic Church in its relationship to society at large. The challenge is one in which, in order to uphold traditional morality, and avoid not only the victory of mass-murder and unnatural prevention of birth, but of a new totalitarianism in which the family may be destroyed in our industrial (or so-called post-industrial) societies, the social doctrine of the Catholic Church has to be reborn in a dynamic vision of the true Christian commonwealth. The same natural law which condemns contraception and abortion must also condemn unnaturalness in the social and economic order.

Let us look briefly at another interpretation of the so-called population crisis in the world today. There is no space here to deal with the saner statistical account of food production and population growth provided by

such an eminent demographer and economist as Colin Clark, although it must be borne in mind that he has, with others, provided highly-informed accounts of the actual state of affairs in contradistinction with the somewhat hysterical and biased accounts of some ecological "experts" and inhumane scientists whose dire predictions receive so much attention. The main point to be made in this brief article is that the actual causes of environmental damage and shortages of food and over-population in certain areas, lie in the nature of the socio-economic system, which is rather misleadingly called "Capitalism".

The real problem is one of distribution of population and resources and the root of the problem is in an unsound approach and attitude to money and to property. This unsound attitude stems from addiction to the wrong ends for man. Basically, the system of industrial capitalism (now developed into the "technocracy") enshrines the motive of greed for money and power as a mainspring of economic life. This worship of Mammon (for that, basically, is what it is) coalesced with a narrow and materialistic science, divorced from wisdom and wedded increasingly to commercial technology; and, with the impetus received from evolutionary notions of progress, developed into the technocracy we know today. Waste is endemic in this system. And this colossal waste is the cause of pollution and associated environmental problems. An economy based on mass-production, kept going by mass-manipulation in advertising campaigns, is an economy of proliferating waste. Planned and built-in obsolescence not only mean production of multitudinous goods which last for a brief time and are then thrown out; the advertising mass-consumption economy is cancerous. It necessitates the continuous growth of industries which pour waste into earth, air and water; it promotes a continuous search for more and more raw materials to replenish the mountains of material used up in the rubbish economy. Moreover, this whole system promotes, by its very nature, centralisation of population and resources. It is the cause

of all the problems of giant anti-cities, commonly known by the term, megalopolis. The "secular city" to which Harvey Cox would have us aim as the ultimate milieu and towards which Teilhard de Chardin's evolutionism inevitably leads as the "norm", is the unavoidable outcome of this economic system.

All of this is not to adopt the view that economic motivations are the real foundation of a social system. This interpretation of the cause of the environmental problem is not another variation on Marxist sociology. Rather it is a recognition of the extent to which the capitalist economic system has dominated our whole way of life to the neglect of higher aims, to the neglect of wisdom and spirituality. Centralism of population and of resources springs from a basic materialism; and it is "justified" by reference to evolutionary notions of progress in which the idea of the good life is left unexamined or simply equated with more and more of the goods and services provided by technology. The machine and its products, the bureaucratic organisation of life in all its aspects in the name of Progress, is eliminating even a basically human way of life in the modern world.

A highly centralised urban existence promoted by a waste economy, then, is the cause of apparent over-population and of pollution in industrial countries. And the monopolisation of materials and of wealth by these countries perpetuates the misery of other parts of the world. Not only is this the case, but it is also true that, in every country where industrialism takes root, villages, towns and genuine community life disappear. Rural freedoms and refreshments decline rapidly and whole populations are forced into the bourgeois-proletarian mass, losing their vitality; variety and sense of independence. In these conditions, the sense of the sacred dries up, tradition dies and alienation and boredom increase apace. The advertising economy is incompatible with traditional values and a sense of history; it is inseparable from an incurable modernity. After all, to sell the product, the assumption

has to be that the latest is the best; and any permanent values are incompatible with mere fashion as a guide to a way of life.

Modern compulsory, secular schooling feeds this economy with human products. It has to be conformist. Even the attempt to reform the system within a secular mould is really another adjustment to the particular stage reached by a socio-economic system in which all values are only relative; in which change is seen as the criterion of progress. And in this milieu, questioning of the assumptions underlying the priorities which shape education is stultified by the dominant philosophical approach (or anti-philosophy, as the Thomists Gilson and Maritain would maintain) of logical positivism which denies any basis for ethics as an objective reality. Tragically enough, even Catholic school systems find themselves, mainly through financial pressures, increasingly shaped by the dominant secularist conformity to the industrial system. In universities, the same sorts of pressures eliminate a truly liberal vision of education, so that theology and philosophy lose their influence in Catholic intellectual life. A liberal education, as envisioned by Maritain, fades from sight, as the State, concerned with the "demands of industry" in education (and even in the so-called post-industrial system) shapes all institutions of higher education in the mould of the emerging managerial technocracy. The financial power of the modern nation-State is such that non-conformity is very difficult for smaller colleges and universities to maintain. Thus, the educational system and the economic system have come together in the new industrial State and promise to be even more closely connected in the sort of society predicted by the planners for the year 2,000.

Catholic Christians cannot, therefore, afford to attack the evils of contraception and abortion without also attacking the socio-economic system which appears to make population-control measures of this kind necessary. They must be aware of the basically un-Christian assumptions of the

industrial capitalist system, and of the need for an intellectual vision in which the divorce between science and technology and the wisdom of religion and philosophy is no longer acceptable. This means that we need to get back to the scholastic ideas on the nature and uses of money, to the Gospel vision of social justice and charity, eliminating usury and restoring property to the people, restoring power to the smaller community, restoring the family as the essential unit of a healthy society. It involves a renewed study of our Faith, and a better use of the vast heritage of thought and human experience available to us through a quickening of Catholic intellectual life. Among the chief targets for attack are relativism in values (now eating into the heart of Catholic theological writings), the notion of unlimited property rights in monopoly capitalism and the negation of all such rights in Marxism, and the deadly trend in Catholic educational systems to conform to secularist values. On the positive side, we can do much to promote the idea of truth and certainty through a scholastic revival (and we have splendid material in the great Catholic Thomists of the present century); we can help to restore small property by encouraging a growing movement towards the land, and we can, and should, fight for independent, parent and church-controlled schools and colleges aiming at excellence of religious faith and excellence in true knowledge.

We must not, of course, ease but instead increase and intensify our opposition to abortion, and we must try to reverse the now widespread antagonism, even among Catholics, to *Humanae Vitae*. We cannot pursue these causes successfully if we give the impression that we ignore or even minimise the environmental problems, or that we are unaware of the injustices in the industrial capitalist system. Unfortunately, it seems true that, in many cases, the theologians and Catholic humanists who favour contraception are also the ones who are most vocal about the iniquities and the exploitative features of capitalist societies.

In general, of course, they do not see the deeper issues and their critique is mostly superficial. But we who support the perennial teaching of the Catholic Church, who will not compromise on matters of Faith and Morals as taught by the Church's official voice, must not let our case on contraception appear callous or uninformed. More deeply, we must get down to the root of the malaise that has brought us to the brink of a terrifying twisted social system in which even a human way of life threatens to be replaced by a robot-like existence under a totalitarian State which would eventually make even the present Soviet prototype look mild.

As far as the socio-economic sphere is concerned (and this affects formal education), all of this exposition of our ills may be summed up in two main principles: the principle of distribution and the principle of subsidiarity. Property and power need to be distributed if a healthy society is to be re-shaped, and the local community and local needs have to be re-asserted. But without a spiritual renewal, any intellectual and social movement will fail. Part of this renewal, it seems to me, must be the revival of our traditional liturgical forms and our sense of an authority based on both natural law and on the Revelation of Christ. And central to such a change for the better will be family initiatives in Catholic schooling.

The Dutch Sedition

7: *Septuagint: Shadow Cabinet of Priests*

ANGELA MEYRICK

BACKGROUND

This article — the seventh in Angela Meyrick's series on the Church in Holland — has deliberately been kept somewhat long. The primary reason is the necessity of conveying to readers, as accurately as possible, the spirit of outright disobedience and worldliness which motivates the Septuagint priests in Holland.

Secondly, it is important that the reader should note the almost craven timidity of the Dutch bishops in their dealings with this rebel Group. Were Hierarchies in other countries to follow the appalling example of the Dutch bishops, the Church would be as near death everywhere as it is in Holland today.

SEPTUAGINT was the name taken by a group of seventy Dutch priests, united in protest. The initiator, who is still one of its most energetic leaders, is Fr. Jan Ruiter (29), a curate in the Haarlem diocese who has been called a Catholic revolutionary. In a press interview (published in *H.P. Magazine*, November 5th, 1969) Ruiter gives this account of its origin: "It began spontaneously when Fr. Jos Vrijburg, student-chaplain at Amsterdam University, publicized his marriage plans and indicated that he wanted to continue to exercise his priestly office (i.e. to say Mass). We refuse to believe that his is an exceptional case; many priests have concrete plans to marry in the foreseeable future and they do not want to leave their office".

It was December 1968. Bishop Zwartkruis of Haarlem

had said in an interview that in his bishopric there was no noticeable opposition to the rule of celibacy for priests; at least he had not noticed it much. Amsterdam is in his diocese. Two days later, a number of dissatisfied priests met together in the American Hotel there, and tabled a motion wherein they expressed "their desire to loosen the bond between priesthood and celibacy". "It was amazing", says Ruiter, "how easily this meeting was set up. Two days' work at the 'phone drew seventy discontented priests to Amsterdam. . . We got piles of post, too; a second meeting was needed to answer it".

This second meeting was held in February 1969, when a steering committee was formed, which proceeded to explain the matter fully in an open letter — to be sent out to all Dutch priests: "Many priests and seminarists of today, because of their financial dependence upon the Church, and because of compulsory celibacy, feel that they are instruments of a closed-in Church system . . . They want to be able completely to arrange their own private lives". Then in this queer little country of Holland something started, and began to spread around the world.

"An important moment", says Ruiter, "was when we decided to internationalize . . . We sent out material (translated of course) to fifty or sixty addresses of like-minded people abroad, asking for comment. The reaction was overwhelming". Replies came in from groups in Paris, Vienna; from priests in Germany, Belgium and, lastly, New York. Fr. Ruiter was chairman, secretary and treasurer of the Group.

In July 1969, the scene of activity moved to Chur. In this Swiss town, about a hundred European bishops were holding a study meeting (from July 7th to 10th). Septuagint decided to organize a priests' conference there too. This shadow-meeting had forty participants from seven or eight countries. The Dutch made a noisy protest at an open session of the bishops' meeting and held a gathering in the square outside. They had come to Chur hoping to influence the bishops and to stiffen their demand for

the "decoupling" of priesthood and celibacy at the coming Rome Synod in October. But they did not succeed; their demand to be admitted as official delegates was politely but firmly refused. So they discussed their grievances and came to the radical conclusions; that the centralised Roman Bureaucracy must go; also the cardinalate, nunciatures; democracy must be furthered in the Church; Canon Law must be fundamentally changed, especially in such matters as celibacy, mixed marriages and divorce. In short, they were aiming at what Ruiter calls "the Cultural Revolution within the Church". Later, the various proposals were clearly defined and recorded in "the Little Red Book", to be taken to the Synod in Rome, where the "united protesting" priests hoped for a confrontation with the bishops.

From October 10th to 16th, 1969, we find Septuagint active among the 200 "contesting" priests from various European countries who were holding a shadow-synod in Rome, alongside the Bishops Synod. Refused accommodation by Catholic institutions, they were housed free in the (Protestant) Waldensian College. There were also hundreds of other priests in Rome who did not approve of the "rebels"; they came from Belgium, Germany and France; and from Spain alone came 300, saying: "This conspiracy must be resisted"! There were minor incidents, and a couple of Dutch priests were arrested for causing a disturbance in St. Peter's Square, distributing pamphlets: "The Catholic Church is a power structure, allied with the worldly powers which use every means to oppress the poor . . . People who attend papal audiences are but cheering cattle".

At the shadow-synod, the influence of the energetic Dutch was, of course, strong. The first day's assembly was presided over by an Amsterdam priest, Joost Ruiter (a member of Septuagint). The Dutch delegation called for less emphasis on theology; for more attention to be paid to "practical" initiatives to influence the bishops in their discussions. Septuagint did not deny that it was a pressure-

group. Although it had bitterly criticized the Pope for his opening speech at the Synod, its members now asked him to grant their delegation an audience. The refusal was firm but very polite, and so carefully motivated that the priests accepted it; Pope Paul had said that he would keep himself informed "critically and attentively" of their problems.

Back home in Holland members of the Group set about making their influence felt at the Pastoral Council. They were especially active during its first session (January 4th-8th, 1970), which dealt, amongst other things, with the celibacy issue. The hundred voters at this assembly, after a rather one-sided debate, came to an almost unanimous conclusion that celibacy should no longer be compulsory for priests. The bishops had not voted on the issue; they were required to make up their minds as soon as possible—the "ultimatum" to expire on January 20th. Septuagint had announced: "We will no longer wait for the bishops. We shall form an action committee to mediate between priests who wish to marry and communities which are prepared to permit a married priest to lead their services. Septuagint will seek a new type of church community according to its own ideas". (They have not as yet carried out their threat.)

The Dutch bishops complied and drew up a document regarding celibacy, to be forwarded to the Pope. While official negotiations were going on all was comparatively quiet on the Dutch front — apart from frequent reports of priests leaving their posts (at the rate of 200 a year). Septuagint began to become unpopular in Catholic circles at home, because of their extremism.

Open Letter from Septuagint to Cardinal Veillot,

Secretary of State.

(De Tijd, May 26th, 1970).

Your Eminence,

On the 19th of January, 1970, Cardinal Alfrink announced that, as a consequence of the standpoint taken

by the Dutch bishops on the question of compulsory celibacy for priests, he would be getting into contact as soon as possible with the highest Church authorities in Rome. Apart from a few vague rumours about a discussion supposed to have taken place in Paris, there is not the slightest indication that these highest Church authorities really wished to hold this discussion. Some weeks ago in *Le Monde*, Cardinal Suenens gave a fairly sharp interview, in which he spoke about this issue and other relevant matters. From your side, however, there came only a dismissive reaction.

The only thing we can now say is that you should be ashamed of yourself. If you continue to refuse to grant to your colleagues the most elementary thing that should exist between people, i.e. an honest dialogue, then it is you who weaken the Church and make it ridiculous — and not those who have the courage to think in a different way from that which has been customary in Church circles in preceding centuries.

If you continue to refuse to take seriously the problems of any Church Province whatsoever, then it is you yourself who are destroying the unity of the Church. You can hardly expect anything else but that a Church Province will take its own problems seriously. If you continue to treat people like Alfrink and Suenens (sic!) as dangerous people, then you will lose the last vestige of respect that you still have in the Low Countries by the sea. You have very little time, because life goes on and, with that life, the demands and problems presented to Christianity continue. It is ridiculous to suppose that the Dutch Province should be seeking isolation. However, if we are confronted by you with the dilemma of an endless wait for a possible discussion or of giving an up-to-date witness to Jesus of Nazareth, then the choice will not be difficult for us. But then you must realize that it is not we who are keeping this false dilemma alive; it is you yourself.

We expect from you that in the very near future you will hold this discussion with the Dutch bishops. Also, it must not be from the motive that they should be helped

in their difficulties; for it is for us still an open question as to who has now the greatest difficulties. If you do not comply, if this discussion does not take place, then we do not see what we can expect from you further.

This letter from Septuagint was supported by eighty members of the solidarity-groups of Western Germany, at their half-yearly meeting from 18th-20th May, in Kirchaehr; and by representatives of lay and clerical groups in Switzerland, Austria, Spain and France.

Cardinal Alfrink's Appeal to Priests

(T.V. Interview on August 1st, 1970.)

In Holland the number of priests who leave the ministry is rapidly on the increase. In the first half of 1970, 183 priests asked for dispensation from the vow of celibacy (89 secular priests and 94 regulars). Last year the total for the whole year was 205. The danger now is of a division within the Dutch Province.

To discuss the problem, Cardinal Alfrink went to Rome on July 8th, 1970. He had two long audiences with Pope Paul, and talks with Cardinals Veuillot, Seper, Willebrands, Wright and other bishops about the situation of the Church in Holland, especially regarding priestly celibacy. The Pope, having carefully weighed the Dutch proposals, and realizing his responsibility for the whole Church, decided, "that the reasons for retaining the traditional bond between priesthood and celibacy in the Latin Church are as strong today — perhaps even stronger — than in former times". In this, Pope Paul followed his own conscience and was supported by most of the bishops. Further dialogue, however, seemed possible, especially at the Bishops' Synod in 1971.

In a press communiqué on July 31st, the Dutch bishops informed their people of the result of the Roman visit. It was received with mixed feelings. Some said "Now we have started on 'the long road' of dialogue, which should lead to 'decoupling' of priesthood and celibacy". Others said, "Now the bishops ought to adjust their aims. It is

time that they put before the Faithful the many arguments *in favour* of the celibacy rule."

In a special television interview on August 1st, Cardinal Alfrink made an appeal to priests, who were considering getting married and still intended to go on saying Mass, to remember their responsibility to their own Church community and to the Universal Church. The Cardinal said that he certainly understood the distress of such priests.

"It is not a question of Rome only, or of the Pope only", said the Cardinal. "It is a question of a difference of viewpoints; on the one side the Dutch Catholic community (perhaps it would be better to say only a part of the Dutch community); on the other side the Church in the world in general. — (I am not suggesting that the entire Church in the world is involved)". The Cardinal also said that there was no personal contradiction of the Pope by the Dutch—or of the Dutch by the Pope.

When the interviewer remarked that he had the impression that the Cardinal was trying to avoid a schism at all costs, Cardinal Alfrink replied: "I did not think it was so much a question of avoiding a breach as of seeking together what could be done — by mutual discussion and mutual deliberations in the form of a dialogue — so that we might remain united".

The Cardinal was asked: "Do you think that you can ask your priests, who perhaps have already been waiting too long, to continue to follow you patiently?" He replied: "Here you touch on very painful matters. I can understand very well that some people had perhaps expected more direct results from the approaches of the Dutch episcopate to Rome — although I have always said that people should not expect that after a single discussion the whole celibacy issue could be settled by a simple gesture. On the other hand, I can also appreciate that people may become so impatient, because of their present need, that they really want to see an immediate solution. However, I also think one may expect that these men, these priests, who have at one time pledged their lives to the Church, should be able

to appreciate their position as priests in the whole world-wide community of the Universal Church".

The last question put to the Cardinal referred to married priests, who intended in the near future or later, to continue to say Mass despite the prohibition. "What is your attitude?" Cardinal Alfrink replied: "This is the most difficult and perhaps the most painful question you have put to me. But if this happens — I still continue to hope that it will not happen — then I must state that the bishops cannot approve of it. I think, indeed, that not only the bishops will refuse to assent to it, but also part (maybe even the greater part) of the Dutch Catholic people".

Cardinal Alfrink said that he quite understood the needs of married priests: "We shall try to find a way of helping to relieve these needs as soon as possible. On the other hand, however, I hope that these priests themselves will be conscious of their own responsibility".

The Cardinal repeated that there was no danger of a break between Holland and Rome, but he warned of the possibility of a rift or schism within the Dutch Province. "Naturally the bishops would find this extremely regrettable". Finally, Cardinal Alfrink asked for sympathetic understanding for the priests concerned: "We ask you again to have patience and to be prepared for a measure of sacrifice. I think that perhaps one may expect sacrifice from those especially, who have bound themselves to the Church as Her priests".

Dutch Bishops' Letter to Priests

(De Tijd, August 21st, 1970).

Main points

... This letter is intended as a more personal note to priests, following on the more 'businesslike' communiqué of July 31st, which reported Cardinal Alfrink's meeting with the Pope.

... Now (in what seems a change of direction — or

emphasis), the bishops called attention to the positive values of celibacy. "Ways must be found to proclaim the evangelical value of celibacy for priests, especially in their training. The disappearance of celibacy would be a disaster for the Church".

... Attention is drawn to the value of prayer and meditation.
... Those priests are to be praised who have remained faithful.

... The sociological aspect of a priest's calling is important, *but* "our mission in the Church cannot be limited to sociological matters".

Note. It is remarkable that there is now no mention of "the long road" to the abolition of the celibacy rule; formerly this was the favourite phrase, which, I think, encouraged many priests to take a "short-cut"—Author.

Septuagint Continues its Action for Married Priests

(Eindhovens Dagblad, August 24th, 1970).

... On July 23rd, 1970 the Septuagint Group sent out a note to all their sympathisers in spite of Cardinal Alfrink's warning. They asked which communities were willing to accept or retain a married priest in the full exercise of his office; what other married priests — "besides the ones we already know" — were willing to function in such communities; and which Reform (Protestant) communities were prepared to nominate and accept as minister a Roman Catholic priest who, because of his marriage, was not allowed to carry out all the offices of his priesthood. . .

... On account of this letter, Cardinal Alfrink, in the name of all the bishops, requested the presence of (Fr.) Jan Ruiter and (Fr.) Joost Reuten to discuss the matter. The Cardinal stressed the well-known standpoint that "a married priest who holds a Eucharistic service (sic) and a community that accepts this, by so doing places themselves outside the Church" . . .

... "Septuagint considers this position out of all proportion

in a Church in which fundamental departures from the Gospel are indeed tolerated". (Here, completely irrelevant examples are given, some from "political and conomic injustice"). Official spokesmen for Septuagint emphasised the fact that "changes in the Church have always been brought about by *doing today* what is *permitted tomorrow* — as in the case of the vernacular and of attitudes to marriage. The toleration which the bishops have shown in these much more important fields, Septuagint would gladly see extended to that of the married priest".

. . . They intend, therefore, to continue their activities in favour of the decoupling of priestly work and obligatory celibacy, because it is obvious once again that: "the solution of the celibacy problem could bring about a break-through to many essential changes . . . They see it as their task to open up communications between communities and married priests. It will be the task of the local community, who is willing to retain a priest after his marriage, to do this in practice and to hold on — even in the face of possible pronouncements by Church authorities" . . .

Bishops' Letter Distorts Reality

(Eindhovens Dagblad, August 25th, 1970).

Septuagint Declaration:

"From the press communiqué of July 31st, and still more from the letter to priests of August 20th, in connection with the discussions between Cardinal Alfrink and Pope Paul, it appears that the bishops as well have given up the wish to retain in office priests who marry. For they declare that not only the world episcopate and the Pope will not entertain the idea, but they speak also about expectations that are not to be realized". Septuagint said this in their lengthy declaration. They said that priests, lay-folk and — last but not least — the members of the Pastoral Council had a right to expect that the bishops, in no uncertain language, should let them know whether they indeed still wished that priests, who intended to marry,

should be allowed to continue their ministry on certain conditions. "If it is the case that they no longer want this", asked Septuagint, "why have they changed their view since January 19th?"

Septuagint said they had a strong impression that the bishops did not really believe in the positive desirability of a married priesthood — that they only advocated it for non-essential reasons and that they had not much confidence in the recruiting power of freely chosen celibacy.

After stating that, in the bishops's letter, any reference to the principle of pluriformity and (national) independence was missing, Septuagint said that the Pope, already at the Vatican Council, had made it difficult to hold a discussion about celibacy and had tried to prevent it. "That bishops who had been muzzled in this way now support him, means nothing at all. Above all, many bishops, by giving their adherence to the Pope, have to a large extent ignored the opinions of the faithful, laity and priests. What the letter says, or suggests, about freedom of choice and faithfulness to the pledged word is simplistic and distorts reality. As long as there is no open choice between being either a celibate or a married priest, many priests will continue to regard and experience their state of celibacy as a real consciously assumed obligation, but not as a vocation, welcomed and assimilated by the heart".

... "To say that the disappearance of celibacy would be a disaster for the Church, we consider to be an unproved and somewhat demagogic assertion, — which, moreover, gives little evidence of a great faith in the inner power of conviction of the Spirit of God, who can give this vocation". "We doubt whether the bishops took into account the opinions of priests, laity and theologians. The confidence they ask cannot easily be given them. We are afraid there is going to be more estrangement and irritation and that more priests will say that this is the last straw for them".

Septuagint said they intended to continue their policy—to treat priests who had married as "office-bearers who have been wrongfully dismissed". They would try to influence

their own bishops and those of other countries by "collaborating with their sister organizations abroad". They wanted to sway the Synod of 1971.

Cardinal Rectifies Septuagint's Declaration.

(Eindhovens Dagblad, August 26th, 1970).

Utrecht, August 26th, 1970: In connection with the published comment on the discussions between Cardinal Alfrink and representatives of the Septuagint Group on Thursday, August 20th, the Secretariat of the Bishops' Conference issued this statement:

"Cardinal Alfrink, at the request of the bishops and in their name, has informed the Septuagint Group that the bishops cannot approve the plan to let married priests continue to celebrate the Eucharist. The bishops think that Septuagint must surely understand this refusal to countenance the intended plans of the Group.

Cardinal Alfrink, in the discussion, has already informed them of the consequences of this refusal by the bishops. He reminds them of the principle that from ancient times has always held good in the Church, which is a community of believers and a bond of love. The person who wishes to celebrate the Eucharist with authority must do so in union with the bishop, because it is the bishop who authorises him to do this and gives him his mission. Whoever, against the express wish of the bishop, performs the Eucharistic ceremony—the sacrament of unity—destroys the true intention of the Eucharist, which is directed towards the realization and expression of the community that is the Church."

Ecumenical Action Centre Supports Septuagint

(Eindhovens Dagblad, September 3rd, 1970.)

The Ecumenical Action Centre in Driebergen made

some critical comments in connection with the bishops' decision on celibacy and the consequent reaction of Septuagint with whom they had declared solidarity on October 9th, 1969.

"After the many and trustworthy opinion-polls among priests and laity, after the declarations of the Pastoral Council, after the Bishops' own pronouncements in their declarations of 19th January 1970 and 13th July 1970, it must be established that the religious feeling in the Catholic Church in Holland is *not* opposed to a change in ecclesiastical discipline concerning the bond between priesthood and celibacy. After the intensive study devoted to this subject it must also be established that this bond is a product of special historical circumstances and can be loosened. Finally, it must be established that in the present situation in The Netherlands, many reasons — and not only reasons arising from necessity — plead in favour of such a loosening. The Ecumenical Action Centre has good reason to take it that the bishops also shared this view-point.

"When the bishops — in contradiction of this viewpoint and in contradiction of the religious feeling of a great part of the Catholic community in Holland — now consider as harmful to unity the holding of a Eucharistic Service by a married priest, it is difficult for us to recognise in this the explicit will of the bishops; and the suspicion arises that the will of the bishops is prisoner of another will, which sets itself against the viewpoint of the bishops and against the religious feeling of a great part of the Roman Catholic community.

"The question arises then, whether, in these circumstances — which nip the bond between the bishop and his church — the old adage "*ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia*" can still be quoted with right and reason. This is even more so because the meaning of the term "*episcopus*" (and with it the term "*ecclesia*"), through the centuries of its history, has changed so much from the concept of the bishop's function, which was that of the old Church Fathers when they used this adage."

Married Priest Leads Eucharistic Service.

(de Tijd, September 28th, 1970.)

... Huub Oosterhuis, ex-Jesuit, recently married (without dispensation) to an 18-year-old student, said Mass on Sunday, September 27th, 1970 in the university chapel of St. Ignatius in Amsterdam.

... A lay member of the organizing committee of the "student-ecclesia" read a declaration in the name of the community, to the effect that the student chaplains saw no good coming of the "polemics" between themselves and the bishop (Zwartkruis of Haarlem). They had no wish to continue what seemed to them "a fruitless game of political manoeuvres", which put a brake on the development of the student-church. An *enquête* had been held among the steering committee and the congregation proposing that married priests should be fully accepted. Of the 222 people who voted, only 9 disapproved — among them the vicar-general of the diocese (representing the Bishop of Haarlem) and the representative of the Jesuit Provincial, both of whom had seats on the steering committee. (Later the vicar-general, Kuipers, admitted that, in fact, 750 voting forms had been sent out and just over 200 returned; therefore only 213 approvals, but silence is accounted agreement!)

... *The Declaration:* Amsterdam's student-ecclesia now enters a new phase of its development, with its well-known team of priests — married or unmarried. "In this community we accept — without further discussion — the married priest, both in preaching and in the eucharistic service. We shall not go back on our decision and are willing to take the consequences." Of the team 2 were Jesuits and 2 ex-Jesuits. The Jesuit Provincial, Deenen, said he would be considering the affair and discussing it with the bishops before he made a statement.

... *The Bishop of Haarlem's Statement.* It began with a preamble of praise for previous "experiments" and developments in the student parish, such as "renewal of liturgy", "a new language of prayer", and new church

music; the "search for a living witness of the Gospel"; "religious freedom and encouragement for many"; "free and open criticism of ecclesiastical shortcomings — with the inevitable conflicts"; "the search for a new form of church life" . . . and so on. The statement continued: "The decision now taken and put into practice touches, in my opinion, not only the collegial exercise of the priesthood but also the mutual links which bind the local churches; for this union of the local churches within the whole Church community the bishops bear their own special responsibility. In their efforts to find a solution for the problem concerning priesthood and celibacy, the Dutch bishops have chosen to lead in a way that does justice to this unity. They regret therefore very sorely the decision which has now been taken by the Amsterdam student-church. . . .

. . . "As bishop of Haarlem, I must now declare that the way chosen by the student-ecclesia is unacceptable to me and that therefore the priests concerned no longer work as ministers serving under my responsibility.

"At this moment I would emphatically ask everyone, for the sake of solidarity within the Church, whatever their differences of conviction or insight, to do everything possible to avoid an injurious hardening of standpoints. Therefore on my side I am ready — even after the choice made by the Amsterdam student-church — to seek avenues by which we can remain in contact with one another. Anyone who believes in the message of the Gospel cannot accept that there can be a conflict without prospect of solution".

Press Interview with Vicar-General Kuipers.

(de Tijd, September 29th, 1970.)

The reporter considered that "there is no total break with the Church of Haarlem — at least from the side of the bishop, who desired to keep contact. The bishop's declaration is very mild in tone, without the use of church law terms, such as suspension and excommunication — still used about ten years ago."

Dr. Kuipers: "What is the use of such terms as suspension and interdiction? What can they still mean for men of our day? These are hard sharp words; with this declaration we simply tried not to use any sharp words. An attempt was made to use social language without taking anything from the clarity of the words. The bishop has not only disapproved of the step the chaplains have taken, but also condemned it—without that judgment being harshly spoken. An ecclesiastical judgment should never be hard. However, he said precisely what is the matter. In legal history there has always been, between the priestly task and that of the bishop, a clear bond. And what does Mgr. Zwartkruis say now? — The relation between your work and mine no longer exists; what you do is no longer my responsibility as bishop. It is very difficult to use the right words; nothing is easier than to make use of the existing church-law terminology. As soon as you get away from it, the difficulty is to find suitable words and terms. Every word of the bishop's declaration is weighed and each word must mean only one thing".

... To the question whether the chaplains by their action had placed themselves outside the community of the Church, Dr. Kuipers answered: "The bishop did not say that in his declaration. How can we say that? It is not for me, or for us, to say that somebody places himself outside the Church. There are people who want to hear us say that Oosterhuis and his colleagues have put themselves outside the Church. To these people I would say, 'I cannot give you a satisfying reply. My personal opinion is that he does *not* place himself outside the Church. Let me put it quite clearly once again: there is a rift between the chaplains and the bishop, but this rift has distinct limits; we must not see more in it than acting contrary to agreement. The declaration does not say either that what Oosterhuis and the others do is wrong in itself. But the fact that they go ahead from their own standpoint, against the policy of the bishop, is condemned. In this sense there is a rift. However, this does not mean that all links are broken; the bishop keeps contact open; and

the personal human contact that is always good, will certainly remain. In this sense, there is still a bond with the Church. For a long time now we have been discussing things with these gentlemen and good personal relationships have been built up. These bonds are not broken now. It is *just a question of differing standpoints*. The chaplains regard the rule of celibacy as against Christian freedom, and that is a legitimate standpoint; but I cannot subscribe to the conclusions they now draw from that standpoint. It never depends on the personal decision of someone or other — it concerns the collegial exercise of the priestly function . . . I personally want to keep in contact with the chaplains". . . . The interviewer remarked that Dr. Kuipers kept using words like perhaps, might, is possible, may be; to which the Vicar-General replied, "The declaration is so carefully put together, the words so carefully weighed that, in this talk with you, I must not say anything which can be wrongly interpreted. The bishop does not want to say any more than he has put in his declaration".

. . . Asked about reactions to the affair, Dr. Kuipers said, "Most reactions came immediately on Sunday, in the form of telephone calls from the publicity media. . . People here in Holland have got used to Church conflicts. The problem of celibacy is also so much a thing of the past that people do not get worked up about it any more—unless it happens in one's own parish. I think it is a pity that it is just on this issue that we come into conflict with the student-ecclesia — there are so many more important matters than celibacy. It seems strange, but I have the impression that other conflicts would have been much easier to resolve than this one".

Septuagint's Reaction.

The steering committee, announcing their agreement with the action of the Amsterdam chaplains, declared "that in our churches, also, married priests may serve in preaching and eucharistic service. Septuagint agrees to put this decision into effect and sends out an urgent call to all priests

never again to leave the priesthood because of marriage". A circular letter sent to R.C. and Reform (Protestant) student chaplains in the country, calling for "solidarity", does not seem to have achieved the desired results (*Tijd*, Sept. 30th). "Many chaplains have reservations about the way it was done". They want married priests all right, but they do not want a conflict with the bishops, who are praised for their "openness".

Tijd, Sept. 28th. "There are more essential problems than that of obligatory celibacy". This issue ought to be soft-pedalled in order to leave room for more effective contest on more essential grounds. "The attitude of Bishop Zwartkruis deserves support. It is in line with the policy adopted by the Dutch bishops on celibacy, and pursued with great courage and foresight in the face of Rome and the world episcopate. It fits also against the background of modern Catholic thought regarding the rights and duties of authority. . . We find that in their action the Amsterdam chaplains have overestimated their own problems". *Eindhoven Dagblad*: "Septuagint must know themselves that the celibacy question is beginning to bore us. . . there are other important problems too."

Septuagint Goes Abroad

Geneva. April 1971.

At the European Clergy Conference, a motion, sponsored by members of Septuagint, suggesting the sending of a letter to Pope Paul expressing concern at his Holy Thursday reference to "married priests, whom he likened to Judas", or indeed of sending any letter with the appearance of a reprimand to the Holy Father, was rejected by the Assembly. This was largely due to the opposition by the Irish and English delegations. "Such a reprimand", said the secretary of the Irish delegation, Fr. Owen Sweeney, "would undermine, before the Holy See, before the Synod and before the world, any good which this Conference would achieve."

A small minority of die-hards did actually despatch a telegram of protest.

Augsburg, W. Germany, June 1971.

A Unity meeting of 8,000 Protestants (mainly Lutheran) and Catholics.

In spite of a formal prohibition of inter-communion, by Bishop Stimpfle, a thousand people, Catholics and Protestants, streamed into Augsburg's largest R.C. church (St. John's) to hold an inter-communion service together. Priests and ministers joined in the "inter-consecration".

"The result of Augsburg may well be that the authority of the hierarchy in Germany may be attacked even more strongly than has hitherto been the case. A specially active role in the inter-communion service was played by a group of 120 Dutch, who were by far the largest foreign group present. Fr. Joseph Keet, a member of Septuagint, and some Dutch laymen, helped to distribute the bread and wine. Among those officiating were four Dutch Protestant ministers (one a woman) and one Catholic priest (Septuagint)." *Eindhovens Dagblad*).

Note: "One gets the impression that this ecumenical meeting in Augsburg, started very carefully by the local bishop, was more or less run off the rails by more than a hundred Dutchmen. It seems that Septuagint agents turned what might have been a valuable encounter between faiths into what was virtually a triumph for Lutheranism". (*De Tijd*).

U.S.A.: Dutch theologian Schillebeeckx says,

"The Church is breaking up, there are free organisations of priests and laity which no longer take any notice of the hierarchy. In Holland this sort of movement is not completely detached from the official Church, thanks to the attitude of the episcopate. But it is getting steadily more difficult."

Spain: Planned meeting stopped by the Government; Dutch priests, who crossed the frontier on false pretences, were turned back.

What Size Differentials ? (1)

J. M. JACKSON

IN any discussion of income policy, the question of differentials is bound to arise. There is fairly widespread acceptance of the idea that skill and responsibility should be rewarded. Most people think it is fair that a man should be paid more if he is more skilled than another, or if he is exercising greater responsibility, or if he is working harder. What is much more difficult is to decide how much more it is appropriate to pay.

In the context of an incomes policy, discussion of differentials is likely to involve two aspects. There is the problem of improving the position of those who are in some absolute sense low paid, and there is the question of bringing relatively low paid workers into line with the average for those with comparable skill and responsibility. This latter question implies a belief, at least on some people's part, that in general there should be comparable pay for comparable levels of work. This accepts the reasonableness of some differentials between those working at different levels, and it is clearly possible to agree on the fairness of equal pay for an equal level of work whilst holding very different views on the appropriate differentials between the grades. Again, raising the level of pay for those defined as 'low paid' must involve some narrowing of differentials, either between grades or between occupations or industries if not both.

If actual differentials are examined, they may seem difficult to explain. Is one job more skilled than another? or more responsible? or does it involve harder work? This is never easy to determine. Jobs may require different kinds of skill and when comparing different kinds of skills it is very hard, even impossible, to say that one is greater

than another. How, for example, does one compare the manual skill required for one job with the intellectual ability required for another. In the past, jobs requiring a high level of intellectual ability have been better paid than those requiring manual skill. This does not mean that intellectual skill is in itself superior to manual skill. All it means is that in the past there has been a more plentiful supply of people with manual skill relatively to the demand for them than of people with intellectual skills. This may reflect a relative scarcity of intellectual skills or merely a deficiency of the educational facilities needed to develop them.

A full discussion of differentials cannot be limited to ordinary employees. We must take into account also such people as members of the professions, and the top managers in industry and commerce. These people may sometimes earn salaries that are very much higher than even the top jobs in ordinary employments. In the present series of articles, however, I do not intend to take account of large investment incomes on the pattern of income distribution.

What is the spread of earnings?

Information is now much more readily available than it used to be on the distribution of earnings. Although the Ministry of Labour published for a long period figures on the average earnings of manual workers, it only undertook surveys to show the spread of earnings at irregular intervals. Now the Department of Employment undertakes such studies fairly regularly — every two years if not annually.

It is not easy to describe the distribution of earnings in a country, even if very detailed statistical data are available. In practice it is necessary to rely upon the information provided by a sample rather than comprehensive data. In the United States, data on incomes is obtained as part of their Census of Population. Whilst this may be useful, sample data taken at more frequent intervals is still essential, since big changes could occur between censuses at ten year intervals. Moreover, sample data is often remarkably

accurate. There have, of course, been occasions when opinion polls have proved very bad predictors of election results. This is not because the sample has produced a different result from a full population. The opinion poll will ask certain questions. It may ask people how they will vote in an election in, say, a week's time. They may indicate an intention to vote for one party or another or they may say they do not know. There may be a good many people who are uncertain how they will vote, or perhaps unwilling to indicate their intention in the opinion poll. Especially where there is genuine uncertainty on the part of a large number of participants, the proportion of those indicating preferences for particular parties may be a poor guide to the election outcome. We cannot assume that these 'don't knows' are divided in any particular way among the parties. These people may, when the election comes, prove to be mainly supporters of one party and therefore influence the final outcome. Again, the poll may show the true state of affairs at the time it is taken, but people can change their minds between the time an opinion poll is taken and an election held.

These difficulties do not arise in a sample survey of earnings. Employers can be required to provide the Department of Employment with details of the earnings of a sample of their workforce. Provided that sample is selected properly, by taking, for example, one in ten of every worker in the firm, it will, in the end, give results which are very unlikely to differ greatly from what would have been obtained if the whole population had provided similar information.¹ Since the information involves something that can be objectively measured, and the employer is unlikely to falsify the information the data collected will be

1. The sampling procedure may require the selection of firms on a random basis as well. Within a firm, the selection is a little more sophisticated than merely taking the first, eleventh, twenty-first worker and so on. A sample must give any worker an equal chance of being included. It may be necessary for example to put the numbers one to ten into a hat to decide which worker will be the first. If the number seven is drawn, the sample will include the seventh, seventeenth, twenty-seventh workers on the roll and so on.

reliable.² We can, therefore place a fairly high degree of trust in the results of the earnings surveys of the DoE.

Even when a sample survey is undertaken, there remains the problem of summarising the information. The most commonly quoted statistic is the mean (often wrongly called the average since the latter term can cover other measures which may be representative in some way of the whole population). The mean, the total of all earnings divided by the number of earners, is a useful figure to know. So is the median, or the income obtained by putting all the individual incomes in numerical order and taking the one in the middle of the list. But both the mean and the median tell us nothing about the way incomes are spread about this representative value. They may all be clustered very close to it or widely dispersed. One could quote the extreme values, but then the distribution can be made to seem wide because a very few people have very large or very small incomes. Statisticians have a number of ways of measuring the dispersion of incomes or any other variable. We will not bother with the more elaborate measures that may be used but only the simpler ones that the layman can readily understand. Just as the median is the income that divides the whole distribution into two, we can find quartiles that divide it into four or deciles that divide it into ten, and so on. In the 1971 survey, for example, the lowest decile for adult male manual workers was £19.20, in other words, ten per cent of all these workers earned less than £19.20.

The bottom decile can be a useful indicator of the position of the low paid. It would not be unreasonable to regard as low paid those 10 per cent of the people with the lowest incomes. There must, of course, always be a group of ten per cent who are the lowest paid in the community. What should concern us is that the pay of the lowest 10 per cent should not fall too far below that of the rest of the community. The value of the lowest decile, which marks

2. The information would be much less reliable if collected from the workers themselves, who would be more liable to make mistakes and also to falsify the information.

off the lowest ten per cent of earners, can indicate what is happening to this group relatively to the rest of the community. To make this comparison, we can compare the lowest decile with the median, the middle income in the whole range. If over a period of years it increases relatively to the median, then the position of the lowest paid ten per cent is improving.

As stated above, in 1971, the lowest decile for adult male manual workers was £19.20 compared with the median earnings of £28.10. This figure of just over £19 represents 68.2 per cent of the median. This shows a small increase from 67.3 per cent in 1968, indicating that a small change in favour of the lower paid had occurred. It is, however, only a small change, and it need not necessarily imply that the living standards of the lower paid workers has improved even slightly relatively to those of better paid. There probably has been some improvement in the real living standards of all workers. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that despite the figures quoted the lower paid have benefitted least. In recent years, prices have been rising, and almost certainly items like food have risen most and those form a relatively higher part of the cost of living of the lower paid than of the better paid. But it would be a mistake to pay too much attention to relative changes over a comparatively short period. What we should really be concerned with is the absolute level of these differentials in earnings and whether the pay of the poorest workers is sufficient for them to live on.

The Lowest Ten Per Cent

The position then is that in 1971, ten per cent of all adult male manual workers were earning less than £19.20. If all

males in full time employment are considered, ten per cent were earning less than £19.70.³ The earnings of women workers are, of course, much lower than those of men. We will find therefore that far more than ten per cent of the labour force was earning less than £19.70. When the 1971 survey was made, there were about eleven million men and five million women in full time employment whose earnings in the week in question were unaffected by absence. The 1,600,000 lowest paid workers were receiving less than £12.11 and were almost entirely women.⁴

Nevertheless, it is probably the earnings of the lower paid men that should continue to receive our main attention. Clearly there may be injustice to the individual woman worker in so far as she is paid a lower rate for the job⁵, but in the case of low paid men there is a much greater problem of hardship to dependent families. (This does not, of course, mean that there are not a good many cases of women on low pay having dependents.)

What is too low?

It is very difficult to say what constitutes a wage that is unreasonably low in the sense that it is too little for a man to live on. One could argue indefinitely about this, and there have always been people who have argued for a minimum wage without the least regard to economic realities. They would set it so high that even before any differentials were allowed for, or any incomes other than wages and salaries, the whole of the national product would

3. Although on average non-manual jobs are higher paid than manual, there are many which carry relatively low pay and where pay is very low in the early years. It is worth bearing in mind, however, that not all those non-manual workers who feature in the lowest ten per cent of all male workers are likely to remain in this income bracket all their lives. They may be paid on incremental scales and improve their relative position over the years, whereas manual workers may remain in this lowest paid bracket permanently.

4. In my own calculation from the published data, I would put the number of men among this total of over one and a half million at a maximum of 9,000, and that is probably a big overestimate.

5. The low average earnings of women also reflect employment generally in less skilled work and less overtime working.

be exhausted — if indeed the national product were enough to pay this minimum. On the other hand, the Supplementary Benefit scale which determines the needs of those who are unable to work and are without adequate means can be regarded as an official poverty line. We can, therefore, ask how many workers have a wage that falls short of this scale. Alternatively we can take the Family Income Supplement scale as a guide to needs and ask how many workers would be entitled to apply for this benefit.

In October 1971, the prescribed income for FIS purposes for a family with one child was £18 a week. A man earning less than this with one child would receive in benefit half the difference between his actual earnings and £18. In fact, about one and a half million out of just over eleven million men were earning less than £18 a week. In the case of men with more than one child, the prescribed income is increased by £2 a week, but since Family Allowances are treated as income in making the calculation, it means that a man with, for example, three children would be given half the difference between his income and £22, but since he would receive £1.90 in Family Allowances he would not be entitled to benefit unless his wage were less than £20.10. In fact, just over three and a half million men were earning less than £20 a week.⁶

The Supplementary Benefit scale would have allowed nearly £10 a week for a married couple (long term case). A man with three children aged between, say 10 and 16 would have been entitled to a total benefit of perhaps £18.55, depending on the exact ages of the children. In addition, the Supplementary Benefit brings a person's income to the approved scale after paying rent. So this could easily mean a total income requirement of perhaps £21. A person in employment, however, would have to pay National Insurance contributions and meet certain expenses

6. It should be emphasised that this is the total number of men earning less than £20 (or £18) a week. The earnings survey does not tell us how many of the 1½ million earning less than £18 or the 3½ million earning less than £20 had one or three children as the case may be.

that would not occur for anyone not in employment. If we add something like £1.50 for this but deduct £1.90 for Family Allowance, we see that a man needs to be earning something like £20.50 at least in order to give his family as high a standard of living as would be possible for a person on Supplementary Benefit. Probably over four million men were in fact earning less than this.

It is clear that there are a good many workers whose incomes must be regarded as inadequate by any standard. Family Income Supplement may have improved the lot of some low paid workers with families, but it does not overcome the objection to a man in full time employment having to apply for this kind of benefit.

So far, only one side of the picture has been considered, the lower paid. Other aspects of the situation, the picture as regards the higher paid, the justification for differentials, and the possible measures to overcome some of the present inequities remain to be considered in subsequent articles.

Why, as God is on the side of good, does the good not triumph over evil? Is it unusual for many of those from Catholic schools to become marxists, maoists and unbelievers? A priest writes from New Guinea that he gives Holy Communion to his Anglican helpers. What do you think of this?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Why, as God is on the side of good, does the good not triumph over evil?

St. Augustine says that God made us without consulting us but He can't save us without our consent. As the Second Vatican Council teaches in accordance with the age-old teaching of the Church, faith is a free assent to divine revelation. If man were coerced into faith his belief would be worthless, and it could not be the root and source of religion. God made us as we are, persons whose essential attributes include freedom; and He respects the nature He created. His love operates unceasingly to make goodness available for us. He prompts us to do good, and, if we, with His grace, will to do good, He helps us to do it. But He leaves us free to make our personal history and to contribute our bit to the history of the human race. The commandment we all live under is the one commandment to love God and all created persons. Well, nobody needs to be told that love is either a free dedication of self or it is non-existent. All normal good is ultimately the fulfilling of the law of love; and all moral evil is ultimately a refusal of that love. So God, by His own will implicit in His creation of us as persons, has to wait for our decision.

The good must eventually triumph. The devil and his associates are creatures, and they just cannot compare with

the infinite God. The means for the triumph of good in any person are available from our redemption by Christ, the Word made flesh. But the work of our redemption has to be accomplished progressively in human history, and that, obviously, takes time.

I heard recently of about half a dozen men who had been in the same class at a Catholic school and who are now, at various universities and polytechnics, marxists, maoists and plain unbelievers. Is this unusual?

Not at all! It seems to be an occurrence to be expected. Many students have left the Church before leaving school. Many more abandon their religion in the first year or two of higher education. It is said to be "a phase" through which adolescents go; but it is more like a major epidemic, and it is a new happening, certainly in extent. There have always been some defections from the faith; but nowadays it would not be surprising if a majority of school-leavers stopped practising their religion. In a country where legal abortion is at the rate of over one hundred thousand a year, where, in some boroughs, contraception is on the rates and the provision of its means is advertised in public transport, and where in other ways morality is "permissive" (which means, in plain terms, that there are no absolute moral standards), young people, at their most receptive and gullible, are strongly influenced to reject the teaching of their religion on right and wrong. They must also be affected by the prevailing materialism which seems inseparable from the self-sufficiency of technological "progress" and from the material affluence which most of them enjoy. They are inclined more and more to reject religious teaching. To accept it would put them in the odd minority, debar them from association with their natural companions, and pitch them into endless battles from which they shrink. The number of practising Catholics, in this country, is falling, I should think; and it is likely to continue

falling until a shocking disillusionment brings the country to its senses.

A priest writes from New Guinea that he gives Holy Communion to his Anglican lay helpers, as "we are very ecumenical here". What do you think?

Ecumenical they may be, but not, it would seem, very obedient. There is no permission from Rome for that sort of inter-communion; and it looks as though the priest, like many others, is his own Pope. He argues, I suppose, that these particular Anglicans believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, that there is no minister of their religion to say Mass for them, and that they have a right to Holy Communion and he should give it to them. If it were Viaticum that he was administering, he would have a case, though he would still need permission; but he is in circumstances hardly different from those in this country: there must be many Anglicans, believers, by their own account, in the Real Presence who have no High Church minister they can go to, and who would find it convenient to go to a Catholic church for Mass and Holy Communion. It has been suggested that anybody who likes should be allowed to receive Communion at Mass, the Holy Eucharist being the sacrament of union. That suggestion was turned down by the bishops in this country a few years ago. The unifying effect of the Blessed Sacrament comes from the participation in it of those united in faith. To use it as a mark of a union which does not exist is a false ecumenism, such as was condemned in the Second Vatican Council and subsequently by the Pope. Besides, when Protestants use the term "Real Presence", it does not necessarily mean for them what it means for us. If they know the word "transubstantiation", which is less likely, they would probably not accept it as the key word saying what happens in the Mass at the consecration. And then where is the "one faith"?

Don't you think papal appeals for peace are futile in view of the communist determination that there shall be no peace?

You are right to see communism as a permanent threat to peace. The unchanging communist purpose is to take over the whole world. That purpose is an essential part of the communist ideology, and it could not be abandoned without the collapse of communism. A report, published last year, of the London *Institute for the Study of Conflict* gives full details of the Russian armed forces facing the West. They amount to a concentration of military power far surpassing any previous building up of armed strength, and well beyond the needs, even generously estimated, of defence. Any Soviet peace moves should be seen against that standing army of a million men, trained and equipped with the most modern weapons. They give the lie to the Russian proclamation of peaceful intentions.

Overtures for peace would always be well received by the Russians and their satellites — if the West can be lulled into a false sense of security it will ripen all the more quickly for the plucking. Why then do the Popes continue their appeals for peace? They are wasting their efforts; and they may even weaken opposition to communism by implying that peace is possible.

The answer, I think, is that the Popes (as well as the Second Vatican Council) not only urge the nations to keep peace but also show the lines on which they should work for peace. The gross social injustices still existing in many parts of the world give communism an excuse for intervention and also win sympathy for its cause among the oppressed. To remedy abuses would be right in itself, and it would also help to make more solid opposition to a communist take-over.

All who eventually arrive in heaven are contented. There is no envy of those in higher places. What, then, is the point of making sacrifices to produce a hundred-fold response

to the word of God, when twenty-fold will get you in?

Will it? What gets you in is your own particular perfection, which you approach in this life and complete, if necessary, in purgatory. There is only one qualification for heaven — perfect charity. Each one must reach it in the individual way required by the uniqueness of personality. No two capacities are the same; but all capacities are to be filled with love of God and of the persons He has created. As we do not know our capacity, which is extensible, we have to try to know what God wants from us and use His grace to become what He would have us be. To aim at a fixed five-fold or twenty-fold is to misunderstand the divine economy and to take away the necessary willingness in ourselves to go from good to better.

I wonder at your introduction of the idea of "sacrifices" as deprivations suffered reluctantly. Do you mean what is called "vocation"? That is a most generous gift of God, entailing a choice between states of life and bestowing a "better" in place of a "good". Is the choice of marriage instead of single blessedness a sacrifice in your sense of the word? If it isn't then logically you mustn't call religious or priestly vocations sacrifices.

You seem to have left God out of your calculations. We can't get to God unless He calls us. Should we not be listening and responding fully, not deafening ourselves when we think we have heard enough and answered enough?

What has the Church lost, particularly the Holy Souls and the Pope, through the withdrawal of the "toties quoties" indulgence?

The indulgence you mention was the one granted for All Souls day — a plenary indulgence to be gained for application to the Holy Souls each time on that day a visit was made to the Blessed Sacrament with prescribed prayers, some for the Pope's intentions. The grant of that indulgence was recently withdrawn; and you ask, most reasonably, if

those who were meant to be its beneficiaries have been deprived of the benefits intended for them.

They must have been so deprived. The Holy Souls cannot have applied to them plenary indulgences which cannot be gained. I suppose fewer visits to the Blessed Sacrament were made, and there were fewer prayers for the Pope's intentions.

So why — the question is that at the back of the one you asked — why was the indulgence withdrawn?

The doctrine of indulgences still stands: the Council of Trent defined that the Church has the power to grant them, making the merits of Christ and the saints available on conditions. The Council, at the same time, called for moderation in the granting of indulgences, lest too great a facility do harm rather than good. Perhaps the withdrawal of the "toties quoties" indulgence was in the cause of moderation. The same Council urged the bishops to make sure the faithful knew the doctrine of indulgences. How many Catholics now understand it? Comparatively few — so that a majority, if they took notice of the indulgence at all, might be given occasion by it to persist in misunderstanding. As I am unable to lay my hands on the decree of withdrawal, which must have given explanations, I can only guess.

Book Reviews

DARK CORNERS

World Revolution by Nesta Webster; Britons Publishing Company, 374 pages; £1.80.

Freemasonry and the Vatican by Vicomte Leon de Poncins; Britons Publishing Company, 224 pages; £1.50.

Those of us who remember the Great Depression will remember best, perhaps, the feeling of helplessness that gripped not merely the unemployed, but all those who were in any way affected by it. Men felt themselves caught by impersonal forces, which left them unable by their own efforts to rid themselves of the misery that oppressed them. It was not that, in each country, the task of economic recovery was a gigantic one, which all but broke those who attempted it. It was not that at all. The truth of the matter was that no one seemed to know what the task of recovery actually was: the depressed countries of Europe did not know how to get out of the economic mess in which they found themselves. They were in the grip of impersonal forces from which, it seemed, there was no escape. The feeling of helplessness thereby induced was all pervasive. The frustration went very deep. And when this happens the tendency is for some to set up men of straw, who are indicted as the root source of contemporary misfortune. It is very understandable, and it happened during the Great Depression, as at other times of national calamity.

I can still see clearly in the London of those days the Green Shirts, as they were called, of Major Douglas' movement selling their literature on street corners, with that fanatical look in their eyes, which told you they alone had the secret of what was wrong with the world and that, if you bought their literature, you would have it too. I remember other groups of desperately earnest people,

eager to tell you that the Jews were at the heart of the world's trouble or — more frequently — that a sinister thing called "Money Power" was responsible for all our woes; and that, behind the scenes, the faceless ones were manipulating the levers of financial power so that they might make millions out of the world's misery and, with those millions, take to themselves the mastery that would eventually enslave us all.

It was always "They" — who were responsible for the unemployment, the abdication of Edward VIII, because he stood by the unemployed, the smearing of Mussolini, who had dared to oppose the "money power", and so on, and so on. "They" were behind it all. But "They" were never clearly defined. This, I think, is why I never subscribed to these theories. I used to ask who the conspirators were and was told that, cleverly, they never revealed themselves. How, then, did one know they existed? Through the effects of their actions; you could work back from what you saw to the existence of "Them". What was happening *could* be explained in conspiratorial terms; therefore, there was a conspiracy. But it could be explained in other terms, as even I knew from the study of economics I was making at the time; therefore, there need not be a conspiracy. Therefore, in default of clear proof, I rejected the conspiratorial theory.

This was my attitude at the time. It has remained broadly my attitude ever since. In it, I have tended to be strengthened by the somewhat naive and over simplistic terms in which versions of the conspiracy theory have tended to be presented since those far-off days of the Great Depression. Most vivid of all, just after that time, was the question of a young American soldier, batman to a Catholic Chaplain, put to me during the war when I was a theological student. I can see him still, standing framed in the doorway of my room after I had opened it in answer to his nervous knock. "Father", he said white-faced, "can I curse the Bank of England"? "Certainly not", I answered at once, "you can say three Hail Marys for

the Directors instead". (Now, I suppose, having been to an American Catholic school, he would no longer be able to do that!)

And yet, and yet; I have to confess that there have been times when I have wondered, wondered whether in the field, broadly, of current affairs as I have known them over, say, the past thirty years there have not been at work evil forces dedicated to the overthrow of Christianity in the world and the recreation of that world not in the likeness of God, but in that of sovereignly rational man. Let me make myself clear. I am not speaking here of the Devil (in whom I have come to believe more firmly than ever in these post-conciliar years), but of men long in his service, working for the destruction of Christianity, beyond the stage where their doing so can be passed over as a "breathing together" and nothing more. Neither am I speaking specifically of Communism (which is undoubtedly a conspiracy of evil men consecrated to the enslavement of the world, all protagonists of "dialogue" within the Church notwithstanding); but of evil men, members of secret societies long pre-dating Communism — men consecrated above all to the idea of reason as sovereign and religion as superstition — who have used Communism (as they would use anything else) for their purpose of building a godless world of the sort longed for by those who made the French Revolution and striven for no less relentlessly by their successors ever since. In other words, is there threaded through and to a certain extent discernible in the history of Europe's last two hundred years and more what can be validly described as a conspiracy emanating from one source or, better, one basically blasphemous idea — that reason is sovereign, so that the world must be remade in the image of man, which implies, by way of essential preliminary, the dethronement everywhere of God, that he be driven out of men's hearts? Is there a conspiracy, far older than that of the Communists, which fosters the conspiracy of Communism as a means to its own end, which is to overthrow Christianity and drive

from the world the last vestige of its influence in the lives of men. There are those who say that this conspiracy does, indeed, exist, that it first showed its face in the French Revolution of 1789, though it was at work long before, and that it will not rest until it has remade man in its image — autonomous, sovereign, without reverence, divorced utterly from dependence on God — like Lucifer, “I will not serve”. All this is the name of rationalism run wild.

I have asked the questions above. I have not answered them. I have done so because there have been times in past years when I have sensed — I put it no higher than that — evil forces at work; more recently, in some of the goings-on within the post-conciliar Church. I make no accusations. I draw no easy conclusions. It is a feeling I have; in no way hysterical, past the point of mere bewilderment, seeking final explanation and finding none. Malcolm Muggeridge has put far better than ever I could the point that baffles me:

“I make no judgment”, he writes, “about something which, as a non-member, is no concern of mine; but if I were a member, then I should be forced to say that, in my opinion, if men were to be stationed at the doors of churches with whips to drive worshippers away, or inside the religious orders specifically to discourage vocations, or amongst the clergy to spread alarm and despondency, they could not hope to be as effective in achieving these ends as are trends and policies seemingly now dominant within the Church”.

Or again, in the words of Archbishop Lefebvre:

“Satan’s masterstroke is to connive at disobedience to everything traditional through the virtue of obedience. The most typical example of this is the kind of aggiornamento effected in the Religious Orders. By obedience, members of Religious Orders, both male

and female, are made to disobey the laws and constitutions of their founders which they have sworn to observe when making their profession. Hence, the profound disorder which prevails within these societies and within the Church."

I agree with every word in these two passages. But why? What is the final explanation? The Devil? Certainly; but through whom does he work? Could the explanation be at least in part that evil men — deifiers of reason and despisers at heart of religion — have touched us? I do not know. I honestly do not know. There is a case — that is all I would say — for those whose God is themselves and who would make the world in their image; for their having sought persistently and conspiratorially these past two hundred years to shape the world by any means available into the mould of their evil design. There is a case, I say, and no more. There is no reason — I have no proof — why they should not in these latter years have turned their evil energies conspiratorially against the Church. If this is the case, they have been brilliantly successful. They have brought it to its knees. Let there be no mistake about this: in ten short years, the Catholic Church which had stood for so long so gloriously defiant against revolutionary rationalism has been brought to the point where, in many parts of the world, it has been downgraded — through the treason of its priests and religious — into rationalism's main ally. This is undeniable. So, too, is the cowardly paralysis which has gripped ecclesiastical and religious authority in face of this subversion from within. The subversion and the cowardice — these two facts are undeniable, whether conspiracy accounts for them or not.

The case for conspiracy — for the continuation over the past two hundred years of conspiratorial revolution against all that we mean by religion and civilization and their attendant values — is made as well and in as balanced a fashion as it can be made by Nesta Webster in her

well argued and well documented study, *World Revolution*, which was first published in 1921. I find it convincing without being absolutely conclusive. It is only fair to add that no study of this immensely difficult subject could be. There has to be a word of warning, though, with regard to the present edition. Its last four chapters written, not by the Authoress, but by the editor of this sixth and revised edition of her work, are, in my opinion, well below the standard of the rest: an example, it seems to me, of the kind of oversimplification so favoured by some advocates of the conspiracy theory and from which Nesta Webster herself is singularly free.

Free from it, too, is Vicomte de Poncins in his important work, the last of many he has written on the subject of Freemasonry. His book is all the more timely in view of the present strange move within the Church to have revised or even annulled the various condemnations of Freemasonry pronounced by the Popes since 1738. Again, one asks, where does the move come from? Who started it and why?

Paul Crane, S.J.